

A LETTER TO ABOLITIONISTS.

MY FRIEND *NEW YORK, DEC. 14, 1867.*

A recent event induces me to address to you a few remarks. I trust you will not ascribe them to a love of dictation, and especially that you will not think me capable of uttering a word of censure, in deference to the prejudices and passions of your opposers. My sympathies are with the oppressed and persecuted. I have labored, in a darker day than this, to vindicate your rights; and nothing would tempt me at this moment to speak a disapproving word, if I thought I should give the slightest countenance to the violence under which you have suffered. I have spoken of the slight service which I have rendered, not as a claim for gratitude; for I only performed a plain duty; but as giving me a title to a candid construction of what I am now to offer.

You well know, that I have not been satisfied with all your modes of operation. I have particularly made objections to the organization and union of numerous and wide-spread societies for the subversion of slavery. I have believed, however, that many of the dangerous tendencies of such an association would be obviated by your adoption of what is called 'the peace principle'; in other words, by your unwillingness to use physical force for self-defence. To this feature of your society, I have looked as a pledge, that your zeal, even if it should prove excessive, would not work much harm. You can judge, then, of the sorrow with which I heard of the tragedy of Alton, where one of your respected brethren fell with arms in his hands. I felt, indeed, that his course was justified, and that he was a martyr to the just and established opinions and cause of the civilized world. I felt, too, that the violence, under which he fell, regarded as an assault on the press and our dearest rights, deserved the same reprobation from the friends of free institutions, as if he had fallen an unresisting victim. But I felt that a cloud had gathered over your society, and that a dangerous precedent had been given in the cause of humanity. So strong was

this impression, that whilst this event found its way into other pulpits, I was unwilling to make it the topic of a religious discourse, but preferred to express my reprobation of it in another place, where it would be viewed only in its bearings on civil and political rights. My hope was, that the members of your society, whilst they would do honor to the fearless spirit of your fallen brother, would still, with one loud voice, proclaim their disapprobation of his last act, and their sorrow that through him a cause of philanthropy had been stained with blood. In this, I am sorry to say that I have been disappointed. I have seen, indeed, no justification of the act. I have seen a few disapproving sentences, but no such clear and general testimony against this error of the lamented Lovejoy, as is needed to give assurance against its repetition. I have missed the true tone in the *Emancipator*, the organ of your National Society. I account for this silence, by your strong sympathy with your slaughtered friend, and your feeling that to censure would so generally be taken for a denial of the cause, deservedly given himself to the cause, deserved nothing but praise. Allow me to say, that here you err. The individual is nothing, in comparison with the truth. Bring out the truth, suffer who may. The fact, that a good man has fallen through a mistaken conception of duty, makes it more necessary to expose the error. Death, courageously met in a good cause by a respected friend, may throw a false lustre over dangerous principles which were tainted with his virtues. Besides, we do not dishonor a friend in acknowledging him to have erred. The best men err. The most honored defenders of religion and virtue have sometimes been impelled, by the very fervor which made them great, into rash courses. I regret, then, that your disapprobation of Mr. Lovejoy's resistance to force has not been as earnest, as your grateful acknowledgments of his self-s consecration to a holy cause.

By these remarks, I do not mean, that I have adopted 'the peace principle'—to the full extent of my late venerated friend, Dr. Worcester, whose spirit, were he living, would be bowed down by the sad story of Alton. I do not say, that a man may in no case defend himself by force. But, it may be laid down as a rule, hardly admitting an exception, that an enterprise of Christian philanthropy is not to be carried on by force; that it is time for philanthropy to stop, when it can only add to the wading through blood. If God does not allow us to fight, we have no force without fighting for it, the presumption is exceedingly strong, that it is not the work, which he has given us to do. Is it asked, how such a cause as this, can be advanced? I answer, by appeals to the laws, and by appeals to the moral sentiment and the moral sympathies of the community. I answer, by resolute patience and heroic suffering. If patience and suffering, of truth and love will not touch a community, certainly violence will avail nothing. What shall men, whose starting point is the love of every human being, hope to make their way by slaughter? Shall a cause, which relies on the inoculation of the disinterested spirit of Christianity as its main instrument, seek aid in deadly weapons? Are we not shocked by this incongruity of means and ends? What fellowship has moral suasion with brute force! What concord between the report of the rattle and the teachings of philanthropy!

Let not this language be understood as in any measure extenuating the guilt of Mr. Lovejoy's murderers. They stand on the same ground as if they had slain an unresisting man. Their crime became before he took arms. Their crime drove him to arms. Because his cause was too philanthropic and holy to allow him to fight for it, are we therefore to justify the violence which drove him to the use of force? Our country is greatly dishonored by the apathy with which the death of this victim to our most sacred rights has been received. Had any other man but an abolitionist fallen in defence of property and the press, how many now could have spoken with indignation! Here we learn how little the freedom of the press, considered as a *principle*, is understood by our citizens; and how few are prepared to maintain it on its true ground. Unless this freedom be complicated with a cause which they approve, the multitude care little for its violation. Unless it be wrested from their own party or friends, they will not trouble themselves with its defence; and here lies its danger. This freedom will never be assailed but in the person of an unpopular man; and unless defended in this case, will not be defended at all. The press of a powerful party will never be stormed, nor its editor shot. From such violence, the right of free discussion has nothing to fear. It is through a weak party, through the editor who respects public sentiment, that the freedom of the press is to receive its deadly wounds. For these reasons, I felt that there was a peculiar call for solemn public remonstrance against the outrage at Alton. In lamenting that Mr. Lovejoy died with arms in his hands, I do not palliate the crime of his foes, or diminish the obligation of every citizen to lift his voice against this fearful violation of civil rights.

Nothing is plainer than that Mr. Lovejoy, and he succeeded in his defence, could not have accomplished his purpose, but would have

placed him in a position more unfavorable to doing good than before. Suppose him, by a sustained and well directed fire, to have repelled his assailants. Would he have planted his press at Alton? The following morning would have revealed the street strewn with dead bodies. Relatives, friends, the whole people of the surrounding country, would have run huddled to spot. What rage would have boiled in a thousand breasts! What vows of vengeance would have broken from a thousand lips! The men, one and all, who had been engaged in the defence of the press, would probably have been torn limb from limb at the moment. If not, an assassination would have dogged their steps, and say, as we should have seen the bright and sunny east reports of murder, till the victim had fallen. O suppose Mr. Lovejoy to have walked with hands stained with blood; could he have preached with success the doctrines of love? Would not that horrible night have been associated with all his future labors? Happy was it for himself, happy for your cause, that under such circumstances he fell. I beg that this language may not be so construed, as if I question the moral or religious worth of Mr. Lovejoy. I know nothing of him but good, except his last error; and that error does not amaze me. That a man hunted by ferocious foes, threatened with indignities to his person, and with death; and at the same time conscious of the greatness of his work, conscious that civil rights, as well as the interests of the oppressed were involved in his decision; that a man, so tried, should fail in judgment, we need not wonder. He knew that the constitution and laws were on his side. He knew that the prevalent construction of the precepts of Christ, which gives a wide range to self-defence, was on his side. We can easily comprehend, how a good man, so placed, should have erred. I believe, in his purpose to do and suffer for great truths and man's dearest rights. God forbid that I should give the slightest countenance to the scoffs of men, who, had he fallen on their side, would have lauded him to the skies.

It seems to me of great importance, that you should steadily disavow this resort to force by Mr. Lovejoy. There are peculiar reasons for this. Your position in our country is peculiar, and makes it important that you should be viewed as incapable of resorting to violent means.

In the first place, you are a large and growing party, and are possessed with a fervent zeal, such as has been unknown since the beginning of our revolutionary conflict. At the same time, you are distrusted, and, still more hated by a multitude of your fellow-citizens. Here, then, are the elements of deadly strife. From masses so hostile, so inflamed, there is reason to fear tumults, conflicts, bloodshed. What is it which has prevented these sad results in the past, in the days of your weakness? Your forbearance; your unwillingness to meet force by force. Had you adopted the means of defence, which any other party, so persecuted, would have chosen, our streets might again and again have flowed with blood. Society might have been shaken by the conflict. If, now, in your strength, you take the sword, you may blow with blow, what is not to be feared. It is one of the objections to great associations, that they accumulate a power, which, in seasons of excitement and exasperation, threatens public commotions, and which may even turn our country into a field of battle. I say, then, that if you choose to organize so vast a force for a cause which awakens fierce passions, you must adopt 'the peace principle' as your inviolable rule. You must trust in the laws, and in the moral sympathies of the community. You must try the power of suffering for truth. The first Christians tried this among communities more ferocious than our own. You have yourselves tried it, and through it have made rapid progress. To desert it might be to plunge the country into fearful contests, and to rob your cause of all its sanctity.

I proceed to another consideration. The South has denounced you as incendiaries; has predicted, from your associated offices, insurrection and massacre within its borders. And what has been the reply which you and your friends have made? You and they have pointed to the prevalence of the peace-principle in your ranks, as a security against such effects. You have said, that you shrink from the assertion of any physical force; that could, you apprehend, excite you to such a pitch of passion under wrongs, as should spare no effort to warn him against bloody and violent means of redress. What becomes of this defence, if you begin to wield the sword? Deeply moved as you are by the injuries of the slave, can you be expected to preach to him submission and peace, if you yourselves shall have caught the spirit of war, the scent of blood? Will the south have no cause of alarm, when the enemies of its 'domestic institutions' shall have sprung up from unresisting sufferers into warriors? Will not your foes at the North be armed with new weapons for your ruin? To me it seems, that if you choose to array your force against the standard of non-resistance, you are bound to give a pledge to the country that you will not violate its peace. Hitherto, I have appealed confidently to your pacific principles as securities against all wrongs. I have seen with indignation the violence of cowardly and unprincipled men directed against an unresisting band. I trust that your friends will never have cause to grow faint in your defence. I trust that the tragedy of Alton will draw from you new assurances of your trust in God, in the power of truth, and in the moral suzerainty of a christian people.

I have now accomplished the chief end which I proposed to myself in this communication. But the same spirit, which has suggested the preceding remarks, induces me to glance at other topics. This spirit is a most friendly one, a sincere desire for your purity and success. I have more than once, as you well know, lamented the disposition of some, perhaps many of your members, to adopt violent forms of speech. In reply to this complaint, it has been said that the people to be awakened, must be spoken to with energy; that soft hints will not break their lethargy; that nothing but a thunder can startle a community steeped in selfish unconcern, to the wrongs of their neighbor. What can be done, it is asked, without strong language? I grant that great moral convictions ought to be given out with energy, and that the zeal which exaggerates them may be forgiven. But exaggerations in regard to persons, are not to be readily forgiven. We may use an hyperbole in stating a truth. We must not be hyperbolic in setting forth the wrong doing of our neighbor. As an example of the unjust severity which I blame, it may be stated, that some among you have been accustomed to denounce slaveholders as 'robbers and man-stealers.' Now, robbery and stealing are words of plain signification. They imply that a man takes *consciously and with knowledge* that belongs to another. To steal, is to seize privately, to rob, is to seize by force, the *acknowledged property* of one's neighbor. Now, is the slaveholder to be charged with these crimes? Does he *know* that the slave he holds is not his own? On the contrary, is there any part of his property, to which he thinks himself to have a stronger right? I grant that the delusion is monstrous one. I tremble with horror the claim of ownership of a human being. I can as easily think of owning an angel, as of owning a man. But do we not know, that there are men at the North, who, regarding the statute-book as of equal authority with the *Sermon on the Mount*, and looking on legal as synonymous

with moral right, believe that the civil law can create property in a man, as easily as in a brute, and who, were they consistent, would think themselves authorized to put their parents under the lash, should the legislature decree, that at a certain age, the parent should become the slave of the child? Is it wonderful, then, that men, brought up in sight of enslaved human beings, in the habit of treating them as chattels, and amidst laws, religious teachings, and a great variety of institutions, which recognize this horrible claim, should seriously think themselves the owners of their fellow-creatures? We are sure, that they do view the slave as property; and thus viewing him, they are no more guilty of robbing and stealing, than one of you would be, who, by misapprehension, should appropriate to himself what belongs to another. And are we authorized to say, that there are none at the South, who, if they should discover their misapprehension, would choose to impoverish themselves, rather than live by robbery and crime? Are all hearts open to our inspection? Has God assigned to us his prerogative of judgment? Is not a violation of the laws of Christian charity, to charge on men, whose general deportment shews a sense of justice, such flagrant crimes as robbery and theft? It is said, that by such allowances to the master, we diminish the power of what I have written against slavery. But I have furnished a pillow for the conscience of the slaveholder. But truth is truth, and we must never wink it out of sight for the sake of effect. God needs not the help of our sophistry or exaggeration. For the sake of awakening sensibility, we must not, in our descriptions, add the weight of a feather to the sufferings of the slave, or the faintest shade to the guilt of the master. Slavery indeed, regarded as a violation of man's most sacred rights, should always be spoken of by us with the deepest abhorrence; and we ought not to conceal our fear, that, among those who vindicate it, in this free and Christian land, there must be many who wilfully shut their eyes on its wrongs, who are victims of a voluntary blindness, as criminal as known and chosen transgression. Let us speak the truth, and the whole truth, and speak it in the language of strong conviction. But let neither policy nor passion carry us beyond the truth. Let a severe principle of duty, stronger than excitement, watch and preside over all our ut-

Allow me here to speak of what seems to me a very objectionable mode of action, which your Society are inclined to adopt: I mean, the exclusion of slaveholders from the privileges of the Christian church. I did hope that the partition walls, which an unenlightened zeal has so long erected round the communion table, were giving way; and that none would be excluded, except such as should give proof in their lives of hostility to the Christian law. That the Lord's Supper should be turned into a weapon of assault on our opponents, is a monstrous abuse of it. Will it be said, that the slaveholder cannot be a Christian, and must therefore be shut out? Do we not know, that God has true worshippers in a land of slavery? Is adherence to a usage, which has existed for ages in the church, an infallible proof of an unassaulted mind? Was not GAIUS a Christian, although a slaveholder? My last conversation, with that excellent man turned on slavery; and though he listened patiently to the hope, which I expressed, that this evil was to cease, he gave no reason, which I can remember. Let it not be said, that by communication, the conscience of the slaveholder will be awakened. We must not for this, or any other good, turn a Christian ordinance from its end. The Lord's Supper was instituted to unite in closer bonds the friends of the common Saviour, and through this union to make them more receptive of light and purifying influence from one another. Let it not be turned into a brand of discord. The time will undoubtedly come, when good men will shrink from slaveholding more than from death. But many a sincere disciple is at present blinded to this outrage on human rights; and he ought not to be banished from the table which Christ has spread for all his friends.

I find in your writings a mode of excusing your severity of language, which I think unsound. You justify yourselves by the strong rebukes uttered by Jesus Christ. But Christ must be followed cautiously here. Was he not a prophet? Was he not guided by a wisdom granted to him alone? Had he not an insight into the hearts and characters of men, which gave a certainty to his severer judgments? Shall the Christian speak with the authority of his Lord? Nor is this all. Jesus could reprove severely, without the dangers which besets all human reproof. His whole spirit was love. There was not a prejudice or passion in his breast, to darken or distort his judgment. He could not err on the side of harshness. Are we so secured? Could he say of himself, 'I am meek and lowly in heart.' So unbounded was his generosity and candor, that, in the agonies of death, he prayed for the enemies who had nailed him to the cross, and urged in their behalf the only extenuation which their crime would admit. Such a being might safely trust himself to his most excited feelings. His consciousness of perfect love to his worst foes, assured him against injustice. How different was rebuke from the lips of Jesus, from that which breaks from ours! Had we been as he, would he said, 'Alas! for you, Pharisees, hypocrites, who shall have heard those words which breathed the purest philanthropy. We should have seen a countenance, on which the indwelling divinity had impressed a celestial love. How different were these rebukes from the harsh tones and hard looks of man! Christ's denunciations had for their groundwork, if I may so speak, a character of perfect benignity, sweetness, forgiveness; and they were in harmony with this. They were scattered through a life, which was spent in spreading blessings with the munificence of a God. You justify your severity by Christ's. Let your spirit be as gentle, your lives as beneficent as his, and I will promise to be contented with your severest rebukes.

Having expressed my disapprobation and fears, I feel that it is right to close this letter with expressing the deep interest I feel in you, not as an association, but as men pledged to the use of all lawful means for the subversion of slavery. There is but one test by which individuals or parties can be judged, and that is the *principles* from which they act, and which they are pledged to support. No matter how many able men a party may number in its ranks; unless pledged to *great principles*, it must pass away, and its leaders sink into oblivion. There are two great principles to which you are devoted, and for which I have always honored you. The first is, the freedom of the press. This you have not only vindicated with your lips and pen; but you have asserted it by your persecutions. The right of a free press to publish his censure on subjects of deep concern to society and humanity, this you have held fast when most men would have shrunk from it. This practical assertion of a great principle, I hold to be worth more than the most eloquent professions of it in public meetings, or than all the vindications of it in the closet. I have thanked you, and thank you again, in the name of liberty, for this good service which you have rendered here. I know of none, to whom her debt is greater. There was a time when the freedom of the press needed no defenders in our land, for it was strong in the love of the people. It was recognized as the pervading life, the conserva-

live power of our institutions. A voice raised against it would have been pronounced moral treason. We clung to it as an immutable principle, as a universal and inalienable right. We received it as an intuitive truth, no more to be questioned than a law of nature. But the times are changed, and we change with them.' Are there no signs, is there nothing to make us fear, that the freedom of speech and the press, regarded as a *right* and a *principle*, is dying out of the hearts of this people? It is not a sufficient answer to say, that the vast majority speak and publish their thoughts without danger. The question is, whether this freedom is distinctly and practically recognized as *every man's right*. Unless it stand on this ground, it is little more than a name; it has no permanent life. To refuse it to a minority, however small, is to loosen every man's hold of it, to violate its sacredness, to break up its foundation. A despotism, to strong for fear, may, through its very strength, allow to the mass great liberty of utterance; but in conceding it as a privilege, and not as a *right*, and by withholding it at pleasure from offensive individuals, the despot betrays himself as truly, as if he had put a seal on every man's lips. That State must not call itself free, in which any party, however small, cannot safely speak their minds; in which any party are exposed to violence for the exercise of a universal right; in which the laws, made to protect all, cannot be sustained against brute force. The freedom of speech and the press seems now to be sharing the fate of all great principles. History shows us, that all great principles, however ardently espoused for a time, have a tendency to fade into traditions, to degenerate into a hollow cant, to become words of little import, and to remain for condemnation, when their vital power is gone. At such a period, every good citizen is called to do what in him lies, to restore their life and power. To some, it may be a disheartening thought, that the battle of liberty is never to end, that its first principles must be established anew, on the very spots where they seemed immovably fixed. But it is the law of our being, that no true good can be made sure without struggle; and it should cheer us to think that to struggle for the right is the noblest use of our powers, and the only means of happiness and perfection.

Another ground of my strong interest in your body is, that you are pledged to another principle, far broader than the freedom of the press, and on which this and all other rights repose. You start from the sublimest truce of repose. You oppose slavery, not from political or worldly considerations. You take your stand on the unalterable worth of every human being, and on his inalienable rights as a rational, moral, and immortal child of God. His rights are his strength. Unlike the political parties, which agitate the country, you have a *principle*, and the grandest which can unite a body of men. That you fully comprehend it, or are always faithful to it, cannot be affirmed; but you have it, and it is cause of joy to see men seizing even in an imperfect form. All slavery, all oppressive institutions, all social abuses, spring from or involve contempt of human nature. The tyrant does not know, *who* it is whom he tramples in the dust. You have caught a glimpse of the truth. The inappreciable worth of every human being, and the derivation of his rights, not from paper constitutions and human laws, but from the spiritual and immortal laws, from his own spirit, are the only grounds on which his rights can stand.

the truths, which are to renovate society, but the light, which our present civilization will not allow to be seen, because it impresses upon the people, by the power of the press, that brotherhood will more and more unite the divided and struggling family of man. My great interest in you lies in your assertion of these truths. The liberation of three million slaves is indeed a noble object; but a greater work is, the diffusion of principles, by which every yoke is to be broken, every government to be regenerated, and a liberty, more precious than civil or political, is to be secured to the world. I know with what indifference that doctrine of the infinite worth of every human being, be his rank or color what it may, is listened to by multitudes. But it is not less true because men of narrow and earthly minds cannot comprehend it. It is written in blood on the cross of Christ. He taught it when he ascended, and carried our nature to heaven. It is affirmed by all the inquiries of philosophy into the soul, by the progress of the human intellect, by the affections of the human heart, by man's interdependence, by his sacrifices for his fellow creatures. I am encouraged by the fact, that this great truth has been espoused most earnestly by a party which numbers in its ranks few great names. The prosperous and distinguished of this world, given as they generally are to epicurean self-indulgence and to vain show, are among the last to comprehend the worth of a human being, to penetrate into the evils of society, or to impart to it a fresh impulse. The less prosperous classes furnish the world with its reformers and martyrs. These, however, from

imperfect creature, are apt to narrow themselves to one idea, to fasten their eyes on a single evil, to lose the balance of their minds, to be kindle with a feverish enthusiasm. Let such remember, that no man should take on himself the office of a reformer, whose zeal in a particular cause is not tempered by extensive sympathies and universal love. This is a high standard, but not too high for men who have started from the great principle of your association. They, who found their efforts against oppression on *every* man's near relation to God, on every man's participation of a moral and immortal nature, cannot without singular inconsistency grow fierce against the many in their zeal for a few. From a body, founded on such a principle, ought to come forth more enlightened friends of the race, more enlarged philanthropists, than have yet been trained. You have dishonored the divine truth, which you have espoused as your creed and your rule. Show forth the energy in what you do and suffer. Show to us the celestial purity, in your freedom from all earthly passions. Prove it to be from God, by sincere trust in his Providence, by fearless obedience of his will, by imitating his impartial justice and his universal love.

I now close this long letter. I have spoken the more freely, because I shall probably be prevented by various and pressing objects, from communicating with you again. In your great and holy purpose, you have my sympathies and best wishes. I implore for you the guidance and blessing of God.

Very sincerely, your friend

very sincerely, your friend,
WM. E. CHANNING.

LETTER OF DR. CHANNING.

THE foregoing Letter has been tendered to us, by its author, for publication in the Liberator. It will answer our good purpose, at least—namely, to stimulate conversation, excite private and public discussion, and thus help to carry out the *good work* of *reformation*. Nothing is so pregnant with evil, social, political and moral, as the public mind in a state of stagnancy; for it then becomes a Dead Sea, in which nothing that has life can exist. Whatever, therefore, serves to ruffle its surface, or put its water into billowy commotion,—from the gentlest breath of heaven to the all-sweeping hurricane,—is better than the absence of vitality. So this Letter, though it is defective in principle, false in its charity, and inconsistent in its reasoning, will doubtless be useful to the Liberator, by thus being so useful as a provocative, as better than the absence of any challenge to universal attention. Its spirit is commendable and amiable; its purpose, unquestionably good.

its style, elevate and transpicuous. The motives of this author, in addressing it to the abolitionists of this country at the present time, we doubt not are pure, be lieve we do, and commendable. Dr. Channing, if he is some times cautious even to criminality, has no duplicity of motive. We have never distrusted, and certainly do not intend to impeach, his sincerity; but sincerity is compatible with error not less than with truth: it is neither wisdom nor rectitude: it is a divorcement from hypocrisy, but not necessarily an alliance with right. As a whole, (though a small portion of it is not without value,) the Letter contains little to enlighten, reform or elevate public sentiment; for what is *contradictory* fails to be either instructive or salutary.

The recent spirited appeal of Dr. Channing from the arbitrary decision of the city authorities, respecting the opening of Faneuil Hall, as well as his Letter to Henry Clay, led us to hope that his vision was becoming more clear, his spirit more intrepid, and his acquaintance with the real state of the hearts of slaveholders more accurate. But this Letter shows no improvement: it, too, is beset with marks of new infirmities.

may, it is morally a abolitionist's upon the christian obligation not to resort to carnal weapons in self-defence, of the aid of the cause of liberty, finds a sincere response in our own bosom, because it is in accordance with our individual sentiments. But, with all deference, we ask, is it consistent, is it decorous, can it be instructive, for a man who rejects the doctrine of non-resistance, to enforce it as a religious duty upon others—upon those who are most exposed to perils, suffering, and lawless outrages of the most flagitious character? We humbly conceive that Dr. Channing is not qualified, at present, to instruct abolitionists in relation to 'the peace principle.' There is a beam in his own eye—a mote only in theirs. He confesses that his late justly venerated friend, Dr. Worcester, was more long-suffering, pacific and merciful, in *principle*, to those who offend, than he himself disposed to be in *conduct*.—He observes—'I do not believe that I can in no case defend myself by force.' Indeed! But a greater than Dr. Channing does—Jesus the Prince of Peace. We are not any wiser for the exception which the Dr. makes: he neglects to designate the case in which a man may defend himself by force. But he does not hesitate to express his disapprobation of Mr. Lovejoy's resistance, and also his opinion that 'it is time for philanthropy to stop, when it can only advance by wading through blood.' The theory, therefore, if we rightly apprehend it, is this:

A cause which is not benevolent will authorize the shedding of blood without guilt; that which is, will not. So that I kill a robber merely for my own preservation, I do well—but if I lay down my life in defence of liberty, the rights of man, and the cause of God, a means of course be shocked by this incongruity of means and ends.¹ Certainly this is a nice distinction. 'If God does not allow us to forward a work of love [in a fearful emergency] by fighting for it, what other work may be forwarded at the point of the bayonet? If men may fight at all, may they not fight for that which

most valuable, which most deeply concerns mankind, which generally seeks universal instead of particular good? We should like to know how it happens, that abolitionists are obligated to allow themselves to be torn in pieces by human tigers, any more than others, or why they may not fight for liberty like others.

To the other complaints of Dr. Channing against the use of 'hard language' by the abolitionists, against calling slaveholders robbers and men stealers, and excluding them from the communion table, we have already room to say, that they originate clearly in the unwillingness of Dr. C. to judge of the tree by its fruit. We may denounce sin in the abstract, or even in the lump, as much as we please; but to say, 'Thou art a man,'—to identify and arraign men as sinners, ah! this is not to be tolerated by decency, good manners, or christian charity! But to show how utterly incoherent and strangely contradictory is Dr. C.'s language on slavery, we subjoin the following *moral cross readings* from his writings. Here are paradoxes!

DR. CHANNING versus ROBERTS. CHANNING.
Republicans & Christiansa silis *Gobblers & Menstruators*
NOT GUILTY. "Abolitionism came to me to have a more tolerant towards the slaveholders, and towards those in the free states who oppose them, or who refuse to take part in their measures. I say first, towards the slaveholders. The abolitionist has not spoken, and he has not acted, as a very too strongly. No language can exceed the enormity of the wrong. But the whole class of slaveholders are not equally guilty. In the free slavery publications which is felt to be unjust, and is certainly unjust. . . . The

ROBERTS. "He, who cannot see his brother, a child of God, man possessing all the rights of humanity, under a skin darker than his own, venturing to call him a heathen. He worships the Outward. *The Spirit is not yet revealed to him.*" [Work of Slavery: p. 10, Introduction.

"The spirit of Christianity is universal justice. It respects all the rights of all men. It is not more powerful obscure, to be wronged, without condemning the wrong-doer."—p. 11 do.

man who is the author of robbery; for he selfishly robs his fellow creatures not only of their rights, but of their souls. He is the worst of tyrants; for whilst absolute government strips them of their rights, he strips them of personal rights. But I do not, exactly believe that the MAJORITY is the character now described. I believe that the MAJORITY is the character who is the cause of the consistency of emancipation with the well-being of the colored race and the nation. He is the man who relinquish their hold on the slave, and sacrifice their imagined property for the sake of justice and humanity. They shrink from emancipation, because they are afraid of the majority. Having seen the colored man continually dependent on foreign capital, they are afraid to make him incapable of providing for himself. Having seen

“The slaveholder claim the slave as his property. The very idea of a slave is a contradiction to another. He is bound to live and labor for another, to be another man's property. The mother's will his habitus, his law, however adverse to his own. Another owns him, and he is bound to live in his time and strength, and labor to the fruits of his labor, for the benefit of another. He is bound to consent, and to determine the kind and duration of his toil, and to give up his property, and to give up a right to extort the labor required work by stripes, and to give up a right, in word, to use him as he pleases, and to fight against his will, and in denial of his right to dispose of his person, or to use his power for his own good.”—p. 18.

“The very essence of slavery is the utter subordination less into the hands of another.”—p. 17.

the laboring class kept by
the slaveholder. The moral
of the restraint would be
a signal to universal law-
lessness and crime. That
is the only way to blame
those who *perpetrate*
slavery. I do not say. . .
Still, while there is much to
be said for the moral
feelings at the South, we
have no warrant for denying
to all slaveholders, moral and
religious excellence. . .
The fact is that the world
shows us, that a *culpable*
blindness, in regard to one
class of obligations, may com-
monly be the result of a
prejudice for religious and moral
principles, so far as they are
understood. In estimating
the moral character of a man,
never forget the disadvan-
tages under which he labors.
Slavery is held as it is at the
present time, and the

* Now this class of propo-
sitions is a human being as well
together false, groundless and
no such right of man in man-
kind. It is a right of man to
him as property is to inflict a
great wrong, to incur the
guilt of oppression. This
position of the difficulty of
maintaining, on second
of its exceeding obviousness.
It is too plain for proof
To defend it is like trying to
defend a crime. . .
The man who, on hearing
the claim to property in man,
does not *see and feel* that it
is wrong, is a man who is
NOT a man. . .
ITION, is hardly to be reach-
ed by reasoning; for it is
hard to find any paper. . .
beginning with
with denying," p. 11.

* I have men may be right-
fully called slaves, and

tion of laws, by the prescription of ages, and by the gradual process of emancipation, cannot be easily viewed in that region as it appears to more distant eyes. The evils of the latefulness of the system ought to be strongly exposed, and it cannot be exposed too fully. The system must not be attached to all who **SUBSIST** slavery. There are pure and genuine spirits who are not attached to the honored more for the more trials amidst which their virtues are purified. The abolitionists, in their zeal, seem to have overlooked these truths in a great measure, and have turned toward the slaveholder; and rather felt toward him indignation rather than sympathy; and have been too ready to charge unjust injuries against the system, **while he upholds it.** [Letter to Biney.]

¶ A man born among slaves, accustomed to this relation of life, and to the necessity by venerated parents, associating it with all whom he has known, and with his evils to see and feel their magnitude, can hardly be expected to look on slaveholding as a partial and distant sin. He cannot be said that, when

criminal in rejecting it. And we all willing to receive new light. Can we wonder that such a man should be so easily convinced of the criminality of an abuse sanctioned by prescription, and which has been shown itself to be destructive of the habits, employments, and economy of life, that he can hardly conceive of the existence of society without this all-permeating element?

It is not true that his convictions of duty in other relations, though he gravely errs in this"—pp. 57, 58.

* The slave virtually sells the wrong of rubbers, though with suffer unconscionable on the part of those who traffic it."—p. 53.

It is possible to abhor and oppose bad institutions, and yet to abstain from indiscriminate condemnation of those who cling to them, and even to serve in their ranks great virtue than in themselves. It is true, and ought to be cheerfully acknowledged, that in the slaveholding States may be found some of the greatest names of our history, and what is still more important, bright examples for all ages among slaveholders of private virtue and Christian love."—p. 60.

The world's "Satan" is gravely on his brawn!"—p. 28.

"To deny the rights of human beings to form their own consciences according to his energy of mind, is an altogether different thing but as simple duty. Yet they are involved in the idea of human liberty, which is contrary to nature."—*infinite variety*, "no property, then we cannot have equal laws; hell and we see no good."

"If the slave were really well-to-do, he would first manage to secure to himself a comfortable home."

‘Their are masters who have been sold off into the hands of their oppressors of their position, *who are slavery as it is, and who hold the slave chiefly, if not wholly, from disinterested considerations; and they deserve great praise.* They deplore and abhor the institution, but believing that partial emancipation, in the present condition of society, would bring omitted evil on both sides free, they themselves bend to continue the relation, until it shall be dissolved by comprehensive and systematic measures on the state. There are many of them who would shrink as much as we at reducing a few slaves to bondage, and are appalled by what seem to them the perils and difficulties of liberating multitudes born and brought up to that condition.—There are *many, who, nominally holding the slave as property, are in truth his true friend and for the public order, and would blush to retain him on other grounds.* There are to be seen, far among the unprincipled 7 pp. 39, 60.

"S, sympathize with the slave has often degenerated into injustice towards the master. I wish to be understood, that, in ranking slavery among the greatest wrongs of the age, I do not mean to ignore the injury endured by the slave, and not of the character of the master. These are distinct points. The one does not determine the latter. . . . Because a great injury is done to another, it does not follow that the injured party is a depraved man; for he may do it *unconsciously*, and, still more, may do it in the belief that he could not do otherwise. We must judge others, not by our light, but

by their own. We must take their place, and consider what allowance we are in their position—rightly they regard us.

Our ancestors committed a deed now branded as piracy. Were they therefore the offenders? The cause was not *sovereignty*, but *justice*; not *sovereignty* of them among the best of their times! The administration of religion in almost all past ages has been marred by the sacred rights of conscience. How many naves have persecuted and shed blood! What a terrible memory! Therefore, ministers of depravity!"—pp. 46, 57.

* As an example of the unjust justice which I blame, it may be stated, that some among you have been accustomed to denounce slaveholders and others and "sinners elsewhere." Now, robbers and

"What! am I again being, a being made to love and adore God, not deny him?"—continued from p. 80. Should we not draw a strange which to payment could expiate, we would not have the property, and dirties it in a whip to follow! And God's child, desert his duty, and say he will not stand, be despised! Every thing done to be owned in the sinners! A moral, can't be a prophet, but stars may be seen, but not the laws of nature, and the law of Lay not your hand upon rational offspring. In whole spiritual world out, Forker!"—p. 2.

I have taken it as a

stealing are words of plain signification. They imply that a man has *conscientiously* & *intentionally* taken what belongs to another. To steal is to seize privily, to rob is to seize by force, the ancient *Knowledge* property. Now, is the slaveholder to be charged with these crimes? Does he know (?) that the slave he holds is not his own? On the contrary, is there any part of his property, to which he thinks it his to have a strong right? Do we not see that there are men at the North, who, regarding the statute-book as of equal authority with the sacred writ of the Mount, and looking on legal as synonymous with

right, do not regard it as wanting in moral duration and moral being, as they take it, and may seize and hold as property, to become, various grounds have no uncertainty as to the measure of right? In God's laws is to respect man's?" p. 28.

"That same inviolable principle, which teaches us what is the honest duty of every man, and which, in every instant, who are bound to do so." Accordingly, there is no principle of the slaveholder's right, but the consequence of rights." p. 31.

[illegible]

ment has a sense of justice, such flagrant crimes as robbery and theft?" [Cries to Abolitionists.]

"All we to speak of what seems to me a very surprising mode of action, which your Society are inclined to adopt—I mean, the exclusion of slaveholders from the privileges of membership in the Christian church. I did hope that the partition walls, which an unenlightened zeal has so long erected round the rights of man, were being giving way; and that none would be excluded, except such as should give proof in their lives of being hostile to the Christian law. That the Lord's supper should be turned into a weapon of insult on our opponents, is something which I never dreamed of. Will it be said, that

the slaveholder cannot be a Christian, and must therefore be shut out! Do you know that God has true worshippers in all lands of slavery? Is adherence to a true religion a hindrance for men in the Church, an infallible proof of an unchristian heart? No! The *Register* was instituted to inform the friends of the oppressed, and through this means to make them more receptive of light and purifying influence from our Lord. Let it be turned into a brand of discord (?) The time will surely come, when men will shrink from slaveholding more than from death. But many a sincere Christian is present in the *REGISTER* ON HUMAN RIGHTS; and he ought not to be banished from the table, for Christ has spread for all his

DEAR BROTHERS,
I think I never
before, as in the
victim of per-
secution—O no?—
the tendency of
ultraism as
prized at such
men *triflin* the
cause he did not
Owing to in-
days that I was
stars of this sad
of them. Let
position that re-
ity, under the
tionists were pl
upon the press a
assured that we
risk and sacri-
pledge faith-
with the prob-
to kill one w
been right to
was a more c
that at Alton
my head in ha
to this princ
the press ope
the mob. No
lacked coura-
them, who did
givings as to
life, who did
saw the bloody
life of a broth
as did the mob
nation was ex-
lets, and heat
could no longer
But I am an
Redeemer's re-
to the doctrin
sentence—R
believe, that I
give us our tr
so far as they
they expect t
no farther.
I believe the Abol
selves against
Lovejoy as a
good republic,
martyr, becau
one of the plain
—Love joy
good to the
dispectfully un-
Jesus told the
they might be
for, continued
evil and on the
on the unjust
were those th
not even the
your brethren
Do not even t
misundersto
perfect, even
fect.”
As a Christi
event. If I
Christian man
my sorrow, b
would indic
which would
sixty, or sev
I think I
brother the
which I would
mouth of the
simpling Steph
How would
and good will
ify weapon at
enemies by fo
In reading
could not bu
self up to th
came to take
whom seek y
reth. Jesus
thy succor
ky that an
consequen-
upon the mob
—they went
backward, the
fell to the
Since mobs
thought mus
should do w
before the fu
his life upon
raised his ar
that the Jew
was a sate
in the la
yet he nev
he ever app
appears, the
cannot escap
tion he may
to surrender
upon the alt
—O no! He
fact that a
violence, sh
is not afraid
physical fo
derstood.
that, I d
courage and
ed, unprot
and violen
And I earn
monra over
ples of univ
joy!
I said that
tion of our
fear that I
wrote a wil-
d wife, who
to suffer w
for have
disciples,
men in th
seize her
Christian
to refrain
up an un-
understo
fraining fr
impressed
by seized
and const
right ear,
wood into
given me
his pet, a
case, Pet
loved frie
to herself
resistance
is covere
I should
if the con

COMMUNICATIONS.

RESIST NOT EVIL.

BROOKLINE, 12 month, 10th.

DEAR BROTHER GARRISON: I feel never more so great a shock to my feelings as in the intelligence of the death of ELIJAH P. LOVEJOY. It was not because an Abolitionist had fallen, but because a popular figure of the freedom of the North had fallen.

Who of us can imagine the life of a man who has lived so long, and who has been so long a witness to the struggle for freedom? Who of us can imagine the life of a man who has lived so long, and who has been so long a witness to the struggle for freedom?

Who of us can imagine the life of a man who has lived so long, and who has been so long a witness to the struggle for freedom? Who of us can imagine the life of a man who has lived so long, and who has been so long a witness to the struggle for freedom?

Who of us can imagine the life of a man who has lived so long, and who has been so long a witness to the struggle for freedom? Who of us can imagine the life of a man who has lived so long, and who has been so long a witness to the struggle for freedom?

Who of us can imagine the life of a man who has lived so long, and who has been so long a witness to the struggle for freedom? Who of us can imagine the life of a man who has lived so long, and who has been so long a witness to the struggle for freedom?

Who of us can imagine the life of a man who has lived so long, and who has been so long a witness to the struggle for freedom? Who of us can imagine the life of a man who has lived so long, and who has been so long a witness to the struggle for freedom?

Who of us can imagine the life of a man who has lived so long, and who has been so long a witness to the struggle for freedom? Who of us can imagine the life of a man who has lived so long, and who has been so long a witness to the struggle for freedom?

Who of us can imagine the life of a man who has lived so long, and who has been so long a witness to the struggle for freedom? Who of us can imagine the life of a man who has lived so long, and who has been so long a witness to the struggle for freedom?

Who of us can imagine the life of a man who has lived so long, and who has been so long a witness to the struggle for freedom? Who of us can imagine the life of a man who has lived so long, and who has been so long a witness to the struggle for freedom?

Who of us can imagine the life of a man who has lived so long, and who has been so long a witness to the struggle for freedom? Who of us can imagine the life of a man who has lived so long, and who has been so long a witness to the struggle for freedom?

Who of us can imagine the life of a man who has lived so long, and who has been so long a witness to the struggle for freedom? Who of us can imagine the life of a man who has lived so long, and who has been so long a witness to the struggle for freedom?

Who of us can imagine the life of a man who has lived so long, and who has been so long a witness to the struggle for freedom? Who of us can imagine the life of a man who has lived so long, and who has been so long a witness to the struggle for freedom?

Who of us can imagine the life of a man who has lived so long, and who has been so long a witness to the struggle for freedom? Who of us can imagine the life of a man who has lived so long, and who has been so long a witness to the struggle for freedom?

Who of us can imagine the life of a man who has lived so long, and who has been so long a witness to the struggle for freedom? Who of us can imagine the life of a man who has lived so long, and who has been so long a witness to the struggle for freedom?

Who of us can imagine the life of a man who has lived so long, and who has been so long a witness to the struggle for freedom? Who of us can imagine the life of a man who has lived so long, and who has been so long a witness to the struggle for freedom?

Who of us can imagine the life of a man who has lived so long, and who has been so long a witness to the struggle for freedom? Who of us can imagine the life of a man who has lived so long, and who has been so long a witness to the struggle for freedom?

Who of us can imagine the life of a man who has lived so long, and who has been so long a witness to the struggle for freedom? Who of us can imagine the life of a man who has lived so long, and who has been so long a witness to the struggle for freedom?

Who of us can imagine the life of a man who has lived so long, and who has been so long a witness to the struggle for freedom? Who of us can imagine the life of a man who has lived so long, and who has been so long a witness to the struggle for freedom?

Who of us can imagine the life of a man who has lived so long, and who has been so long a witness to the struggle for freedom? Who of us can imagine the life of a man who has lived so long, and who has been so long a witness to the struggle for freedom?

Who of us can imagine the life of a man who has lived so long, and who has been so long a witness to the struggle for freedom? Who of us can imagine the life of a man who has lived so long, and who has been so long a witness to the struggle for freedom?

Who of us can imagine the life of a man who has lived so long, and who has been so long a witness to the struggle for freedom? Who of us can imagine the life of a man who has lived so long, and who has been so long a witness to the struggle for freedom?

Who of us can imagine the life of a man who has lived so long, and who has been so long a witness to the struggle for freedom? Who of us can imagine the life of a man who has lived so long, and who has been so long a witness to the struggle for freedom?

Who of us can imagine the life of a man who has lived so long, and who has been so long a witness to the struggle for freedom? Who of us can imagine the life of a man who has lived so long, and who has been so long a witness to the struggle for freedom?

Who of us can imagine the life of a man who has lived so long, and who has been so long a witness to the struggle for freedom? Who of us can imagine the life of a man who has lived so long, and who has been so long a witness to the struggle for freedom?

Who of us can imagine the life of a man who has lived so long, and who has been so long a witness to the struggle for freedom? Who of us can imagine the life of a man who has lived so long, and who has been so long a witness to the struggle for freedom?

as worthy of imitation. Nothing had I not feared that others, seeing her thus praised, might be induced to follow her example; for indeed we know not what woman may next be called to witness a similar scene. Instead, then, of smiting the mobsters in their faces, let her either surrender herself to them, to suffer with her husband, if she feels the sacrifice to be called for, or let her follow him far off, as did the mother of our Lord.

If we want to see an example of true moral greatness in woman, under the most appalling circumstances, let us look at Mary, standing by the cross of her beloved son, in perfect silence, in holy resignation. Let us watch her countenance as he was extended on the cross, and nail after nail was driven into his hands and feet.

Is there not inexpressible agony of feeling depicted there? See we not that in those fearful moments, a sword was piercing through her own soul also? O! what should we think of her, had she in a phrenzy of despair rushed upon the soldiers, and attempted to hinder them in their horrid work, by smiting them in their faces, and clinging round her precious son? Where would have been her dignity, her moral courage, her holy resignation, her Christian greatness? And what would Jesus have said at such interference? "The cup which my Father hath given me, shall I not drink it?" Let the wives, the mothers, the sisters, the daughters of abolitionists, pray for the spirit of Mary, and then will they be enabled to meet the violence of mobs in such a way as shall exalt the character of woman, and glorify God by obedience to his holy commands, and submission to the events which are permitted in his Providence.

I feel, dear brother, as though God had permitted these things for our instruction; and that the lesson he designed to teach abolitionists was, that when there is no safety for them, no defence either in the laws or the protecting arms of public sentiment, unarmed, there is none in the use of carnal weapons. That there is no such thing as trusting in God and pistols at the same time; and that if life is to be sacrificed, it had better be surrendered as Stephen surrendered his: he fell unarmed, unresisting, praying for his murderers, as did his Divine Master.

These circumstances I also view as a trumpet-call to those who believe in peace principles, no longer to hide their light under a bushel, but to speak out in faithful boldness, lest the blood which is yet to be shed should be found in their skirts. Let the Boston Female Anti-Slavery Society meet, and pose such resolutions in view of the Alton murder, as will exalt the standard of Peace and Righteousness in the sight of all people.

I remain, then, in the cause of bleeding humanity, A. E. GRIMKE.

RIGHT OF SELF-DEFENCE.

DEAR BROTHER: The following notices of Mr. Lovejoy's death must be instructive to all reflecting minds. "Consistency" thou art a jewel!

The N. Y. Gazette says:—An abolition clergyman, lately killed at Alton, with a musket in his hand, which he had just killed an unarmed citizen, looking on at an outrage that the said Lovejoy had wanted to provoke. Why may not a clergyman go armed with musket, pistols, dirk, &c., as well as others? If one may, all may. Christ allows it to none.

Boston Advertiser and Patriot. "There is no apology for a minister of the gospel setting the example of brandishing deadly weapons, and taking the life of a human being. If the ministers of peace will array themselves in complete steel, and brandish deadly weapons, the evil will be likely to be initiated in too many instances. Such violence ought to be discontinued. It would be better, in all cases, if attacked, to leave redress of injuries to the violated laws of the land."

What shall we say of those who will propose a measure which they know will violate a principle? Is there an apology for any one who brandishes deadly weapons in self-defence? For Warren? For Washington? For Nat Turner? There is as much apology for the one as for the other. Ministers of peace have as good a right to "brandish deadly weapons" as Bunaparte; and we have as good a right to defend ourselves against any individual, government, or nation, that brandishes deadly weapons with a view to destroy life. There is no apology for a murderer.

Boston Advertiser and Patriot. "The abolitionists themselves, if they wish to preserve a character for consistency, ought to regard the conduct of Mr. Lovejoy only with sorrow and shame. In approving it, they will be sanctioning a principle which will make them, as far as their principles go, the most dangerous class of men in the community. May an individual take the life of one, and if of one, of a hundred, in defence of a printing press, and may not other individuals, black as well as white, take life in defence of freedom?" Doubtless. If Mr. Lovejoy had a right to take life in defence of his press; if the editors of the Patriot have a right to take life in defence of their press and homes; if Washington had a right to take life in defence of property or freedom; if the slaves of the South have a right to take life in defence of wife, children, liberty, life, &c., all have a right to that. But had the men of Bunker Hill a right to butcher their brethren for liberty? To save a little tax to pay? No. Those who fell on Bunker's Hill, on either side, were murdered. What dangerous men Washington and his co-workers were! What dangerous men those editors were who instigated the mob of '33 in Washington-street! Are all men 'the most dangerous class of the community,' who say it is right to take life in defence of property, liberty or life? Yes, they are. The real enemies of order, the advocates of anarchy and bloodshed—supporting the principles of murder. But to these editors of the Patriot, I say—Ye hypocrites! cease to rant about the danger of abolitionism, while you yourselves are daily pleading for the right of the slave to gain his freedom by the death of his master.

The above extracts are specimens of our republican hypocrisy. Pretending great astonishment and regret that Mr. Lovejoy should fight in self-defence, while they exult over his death for acting on the same principle! Affecting great apprehension lest the example of Mr. Lovejoy should excite the slaves to bloody deeds, while they are lauding the heroes of Lexington and Bunker Hill! Our 4th of July orations, our proclamations and messages of Governors and Presidents, extolling the blessings of liberty, and those who bleed for liberty, all say to the slave, "you have a right to butcher your masters to gain your freedom."

The very men, who are thus exhorting the slaves to bloodshed, are greatly affected lest the Abolitionists should arouse the slaves to deeds of blood! Hypocrites! But ye thus render yourselves vile to prevent the sympathies of the nation being aroused by the Alton Tragedy. H. C. W.

NEW ORGANIZATION.

Abolitionists of New-England!

In the Spectator of last week, I find the following: "We suppose the call [for the New Organization] to be addressed only to those who are in favor of a new anti-slavery organization, for the purpose of promoting the immediate emancipation of the slaves. Those who think the present organizations sufficient for the purpose, will of course not be expected to take part in the meeting. But all details in regard to measures to enlist the entire christian community against slavery will be left for the wisdom of the convention to decide."

And on looking at the 'call' itself, I find it even so—that it is only for those whose minds are made up on the subject. So that instead of having a convention of 'evangelical' abolitionists, clergymen and others, to consider the question whether a new organization is desirable or not, (as I had been led to suppose, and as was supposed was the design of the Convention,) it seems the work of considering has been already done by somebody else. A dozen individuals in this city, whose private and personal griefs may have more to do with this matter than they themselves are perhaps aware of, these have done the considering, and have decided the question of a new organization for all New-England. And now they ask a great convention—and for what? Why, to do up details, in regard to measures? Yes, even so—the WISDOM of the Convention may have full play among 'details.' It may say whether it will have twelve officers or six—Dr. Gulliver for secretary or somebody else—the Spectator for its organ, or some other paper, this man for agent—or some other. The whole field of action is open—wide open—(glorious privilege!) but to say we have there shall or shall not be any society, whether there shall or shall not be any officers, &c. these are questions which are altogether too

grave to suppose it competent for 'the wisdom of the convention to decide!' A society is to be, 'measures' are to be adopted, and officers, &c. to be elected. These questions are all decided beforehand. No matter if the new organization is unequalled for no matter if it throw a bone of unceasing contention into the churches and congregations of New-England—no matter if it owes its origin as much to non-privacy and personal griefs than to a regard for the cause of the slave—no matter if it sanction and give currency to a compromising and spurious abolitionism—no matter if, in the language of the article from which the above extract is taken, it be, in so many words, 'GIVING UP THE MATTER.' (Of course, many words.)

HANDS TO MANAGE AS THEY PLEASE.—And they, the men who have hitherto stood aloof from the cause, with the pitiful air on their lips, 'I like your principles, but not your measures'—no matter, if by the admission of 'evangelical' men and ministers into the convention, opposed to a new organization, and a free interchange of views on the subject, those now in favor of it might themselves, a majority of them, deem such a measure unequalled for and inexpedient—no matter for these or a thousand other reasons, all but 'details' are settled beforehand, by the 'wisdom of'—somebody; and now all that like it, and have nothing better to do, are invited to come, and have the liberty of doing up Mr. somebody's 'details'!

Shame—shame on such a proposition! What are Abolitionists one—one in principle and one in object—and yet have not those who claim to be abolitionists, but who have a new organization desirable, confidence enough in their brethren of the same religious as well as abolition faith, to submit the question of the expediency of such organization to a convention of such brethren? Is their object the promotion of abolition merely? Then why exclude any abolitionist? Is their object the promotion of abolition, and at the same time the security of the interests of evangelical truth, and the evangelical churches and ministry? Then why exclude 'evangelical' abolitionists from the convention? Why preclude the possibility of an interchange of views among brethren of the same religious as well as abolition faith? What means all this but that there is some other end in view, some other motive for action?

Under these circumstances, I deem it my solemn duty to warn abolitionists against the measure—and more than all to conjure 'evangelical' abolitionists, and ministers, if they have any regard for the cause of abolition, or for THE GOOD OF EVANGELICAL CAL RELIGION, to stand aloof from the proposed movement. In the mean time, let all genuine abolitionists have nothing to do with this measure, but give up 'details' and all, into the hands of its originators; and as they propose 'giving up the matter into the hands of the men who like our principles but not our measures,' to manage as they please; 'just leave them to their own companionship, and let the 'few towns' from which names have been received remain, as they are, a few 'few'!

A. A. PHELPS.

THE FACT, that our Methodist brethren have held some anti-slavery meetings, in a denominational capacity, has been noticed by the Spectator in a warrant for the proposed 'evangelical' dis-organization! To correct this misstatement, our uncompromising Bro. Orange Scott addressed the following letter to the editor of the Spectator, requesting him to publish it, as an act of justice to Methodist abolitionists—or, in case of his unwillingness to do so, to hand it over immediately to me for insertion in the Liberator. The editor of the Spectator refused to comply with either request!—thus putting Bro. Scott to the trouble of writing a letter to us, requesting us to obtain the manuscript! Behold, in this act of the Spectator, a specimen of a new 'evangelical' fairness and honesty!—Ed. Lib.

TRUE STATE OF THE CASE.

Brother Porter—I perceive by one of two sentences in a 'circular' signed by Rev. Charles Fitch, and forty-seven others, and published in the N. E. Spectator and other papers, that the nature and design of the Anti-Slavery Society, connected with the annual conference of the M. E. Church, are misunderstood.

We have never formed any 'New England,' State, County, or Town anti-slavery societies among ourselves, as Methodists, or of persons of evangelical sentiments only.

We have, however, formed a few individual societies, of persons of evangelical sentiments, composed exclusively of Methodist preachers, for the special purpose of exerting an influence upon our ministers, and upon our ensuing general conference. These societies are not auxiliary to any existing Anti-slavery organization; though they approve of the doctrines and measures of the American Anti-slavery Society and its auxiliaries. And these ministers generally belong to other Anti-slavery societies, and give the same support to them as they would do, if our conference societies had no existence. We occupy no geographical territory, as Methodists; we call our societies by the name of the N. E. State, County, or Town societies, and have a few in each of the whole of New England with a parent institution, with the expectation that auxiliaries in different parts of the country will be formed. And let not our organizations be pleaded as a precedent for such a course. Our societies are not designed to prevent our ministers from joining other organizations; we leave them all to do this—much less are they designed to divide any existing society!

If our Orthodox brethren in New England, or elsewhere, wish to exert a special influence on Congregational or Presbyterian ministers—and if they think they can better effect their purpose by forming societies connected with their Associations and Synods, there cannot be the least objection to their doing so; and in this they might plead the course of the 'Methodists,' as a precedent—providing their design is also not to divide, but build up the Anti-slavery cause in general. But when they propose to divide the Anti-slavery Society, connected with such a crisis, in a city like this, and surrounded as it is by hostile influences, Mr. Quincy displays great integrity of mind and moral independence. It will be seen that he is expected to speak at the anti-slavery meeting this evening.

Boston, Nov. 23, 1837.

My DEAR SIR: I enclose a check for fifteen dollars, being my life subscription to the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society. I am informed that you are the proper person to be addressed on this subject, and you will oblige me by adding my name to the number of your subscribers.

I do not know whether or not a conversation which I had with you, a Sunday or two ago, touching Mr. Garrison's course about the 'Clerical Appeal,' dwells in your memory or not; if it does, I would embrace this opportunity to take back all that I then said on the subject. I was then under a total misapprehension of the nature of the case, and of the motives by which he was actuated. I have since been enlightened on both these points, and believe that I now do full justice to the elevated character of his motives in that instance, as in all the rest of his public conduct; and his course, as I now understand it, meets with my most cordial approbation. Pray excuse my troubling you on so insignificant an occasion, as any change in my opinions on this or any other subject. I make this acknowledgment solely for my individual satisfaction; for the next best thing to not having been in an error at all, is to acknowledge it as soon as one finds out one's mistake.

I am, dear sir, very faithfully, your friend and servant, HENRY G. CHAPMAN, Treas. M. A. S. Soc.

Boston, Nov. 25, 1837.

My DEAR SIR: After acknowledging the receipt of fifteen dollars, your life-subscription to the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society, and transmitting to you the certificate of the same, permit me to express the satisfaction which your manner of subscribing gave me.

Perhaps you will not see any good reason for the request I now make, that you would permit the publication of your letter; but a few months after this cause will show you so many pretended friends at a safe distance, so many hollow professions of belief in our principles, so many cherished objections to our measures, that you will not then wonder that I should have wished to show the early and toil-worn

view the faults you advert to, as in a measure unavoidable, and, secondly, subordinate as they are, likely to become still less prominent as the cause gathers, by degrees, the aid of more practised writers and speakers. As to the justice of applying the term 'robber' to 'aid' to the slaveholder, I think the man who lays his hand on the child, born to-day on his plantation, and says, 'I make you mine for life; as is very a robber, as if he had done the same thing on the coast of Africa. I think that he who keeps back the hire of the laborers commits essentially the same theft, as if he had first paid them their wages, and then picked their pockets of the money.

You object to our indiscriminate mode of attack. But I answer, when people are doing that which is wrong, the presumption is that they know it. If any one, in these circumstances, avers his innocence, his good intentions, the burden of proof is on him, and a heavy burden it is, here. I sincerely believe that the number of slaveholders who at this time would be fully justified in the sight of God, by the purity of their motives, is as small as was the number of conscientious scribes and Pharisees, when our Saviour characterized them indiscriminately, as hypocrites and devourers of widows' houses, &c. I believe that the number of slaveholders, who keep their slaves out of christian love, is small indeed; and I think it cannot be expected that we should stop to make exceptions, in favor of a class, which has, as we think, but a very prominent (probably a mere theoretical) existence. Do not think me more uncharitable than I really am. While I assure you I have never seen, and never credibly heard of any man, in our day, who continued a slaveholder through christian love, I willingly admit, that many slaveholders have consciences very little, if at all, enlightened, on the duty of emancipation. Yet I think, to justify them on this ground, would be like justifying the Thugs of India, who murder as a religious duty, or the Holy Inquisitors, who rack the body, for the good of the soul. I am willing to place slaveholders on the same footing with other wrong-doers; and to give them the benefits of all the petitions we offer for others persons living in crime. God knows their hearts. We are to judge the tree by its fruits; and we believe that he only that works righteousness, is righteous. Many slaveholders give strong evidence of general christian character; but so have many gamblers, duellists, &c.

I think your view as to Lovejoy's course, deserves much consideration. Yet I think you are not aware that the Liberator and the Friend of Man, (of U. C.) the two most important Abolition journals (except the Emancipator) in the country have taken strong peace ground on the occasion of Lovejoy's death, and that the Resolutions of the Massachusetts Society, containing the strongest expressions of regret at his resort to arms, have been copied into the Emancipator, with high praise. The Emancipator has not, I presume, been forward on this topic, precisely because it is the acknowledged organ of the National Society. Now, the Constitution of the American Anti-Slavery Society contains the usual pledge, that we will not countenance the slaveholder, nor force him to force him, nor meddle with the peace question—the right of defence, generally. The Emancipator could not, therefore, say it was a violation of principle for Lovejoy to defend himself. As a question of expediency, his course seems unfortunate; and yet I see some ground to feel different in this judgment. I think there is evidence that Lovejoy thought it expedient to die. His course was taken, after consultation with Edward Beecher and others of great weight of character; and at this distance, I feel a difficulty in deciding upon it as a mere question of imprudence. Probably he erred in judgment; I think he also erred in principle, as every man erred, who, in any case, lifts his hand in retaliation of evil.

You say we owe the adoption of the peace principle to the country. As much, I think, and no more, than I say it with entire respect to yourself. You are also formidable to the South. More so, I think, and they say, than a hundred Societies. I believe, object to self-defence on the part of the slaves, on the same ground upon which it is placed by the American Anti-Slavery Society. You do not, I believe, deny the abstract right, nor does the Emancipator. Nine-tenths, however, of the individual abolitionists in this country do still, I believe, object to self-defence on the part of the slaves, on the same ground upon which it is placed by the American Anti-Slavery Society. You do not, I believe, deny the abstract right, nor does the Emancipator. Nine-tenths, however, of the individual abolitionists in this country do still, I believe, object to self-defence on the part of the slaves, on the same ground upon which it is placed by the American Anti-Slavery Society.

Violence ought to be discouraged as an appropriate means of carrying forward our purposes. We cannot conscientiously, as a body, give the south any better guaranty than this, which is substantially embodied in the constitutions of all our societies.

I know, sir, you will approve the openness of my remarks on your letter. I have not spoken of what I like in it, but I have thought it right to say where I differed. I feel, however, constrained to say, that I cannot be insensible to the obligations the south owes to you, in this connection, and to you for the calm and independent course you have taken.

Respectfully and gratefully, Your friend, E. G. L.

MOST HONORABLE.

The letters of Mr. Quincy (which are given below) exhibit an honorable, ingenious, upright mind. It is an old truth, that no man, by taking thought, can add one cubit to his natural stature; but it is not less true, that no man, who has erred, (whether in judgment, misconception, or wrongfully,) fails to add many cubits to his moral elevation, in the eyes both of friends and foes, whenever he acknowledges his error. Mr. Quincy is a son of President Quincy of Harvard University, and a member of the bar, in this city. He is a regular descendant of one of the Pilgrim Fathers, whose name he bears. Never should a Quincy be found among the apologists or defenders of slavery. How glowed the fire of liberty in the bosom of Josiah Quincy, of a fatherless revolutionary memory! In his revolutionary career, he was the advocate of our enslaved countrymen, such a crisis, in a city like this, and surrounded as it is by hostile influences, Mr. Quincy displays great integrity of mind and moral independence. It will be seen that he is expected to speak at the anti-slavery meeting this evening.

Boston, Nov. 23, 1837.

My DEAR SIR: I enclose a check for fifteen dollars, being my life subscription to the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society. I am informed that you are the proper person to be addressed on this subject, and you will oblige me by adding my name to the number of your subscribers.

I do not know whether or not a conversation which I had with you, a Sunday or two ago, touching Mr. Garrison's course about the 'Clerical Appeal,' dwells in your memory or not; if it does, I would embrace this opportunity to take back all that I then said on the subject. I was then under a total misapprehension of the nature of the case, and of the motives by which he was actuated. I have since been enlightened on both these points, and believe that I now do full justice to the elevated character of his motives in that instance, as in all the rest of his public conduct; and his course, as I now understand it, meets with my most cordial approbation. Pray excuse my troubling you on so insignificant an occasion, as any change in my opinions on this or any other subject. I make this acknowledgment solely for my individual satisfaction; for the next best thing to not having been in an error at all, is to acknowledge it as soon as one finds out one's mistake.

I am, dear sir, very faithfully, your friend and servant, HENRY G. CHAPMAN, Treas. M. A. S. Soc.

Boston, Nov. 25, 1837.

My DEAR SIR: After acknowledging the receipt of fifteen dollars, your life-subscription to the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society, and transmitting to you the certificate of the same, permit me to express the satisfaction which your manner of subscribing gave me.

Perhaps you will not see any good reason for the request I now make, that you would permit the publication of your letter; but a few months after this cause will show you so many pretended friends at a safe distance, so many hollow professions of belief in our principles, so many cherished objections to our measures, that you will not then wonder that I should have wished to show the early and toil-worn

friends of the cause, the grateful spectacle of a candid mind unhesitatingly following its own convictions. HENRY G. CHAPMAN.

EDMUND QUINCY, Esq.

Boston, Nov. 27, 1837.

My DEAR SIR: I received your kind letter on Saturday with the accompanying Certificate, and should have answered it immediately, had not your most unexpected request for the publication of my letter to you demanded time for mature consideration. My first impulse was, after thanking you for the favorable opinion which it implied, absolutely to decline it, as most repugnant to all my tastes and habits. And I confess that after well weighing the matter, I can hardly conceive that 'the early and toil-worn friends of the cause,' as you well describe them, can derive any support or encouragement from the approbation of their course, expressed by one of whose existence, from the retired habits of his life, they have probably never heard.

Upon this point, however, you are much more competent to judge than I am; and if the publication of my letter, or anything else that I can say or do, can give the least pleasure to those admirable men, or the smallest assistance to the cause, I should hold myself inexhaustible, should I withhold it. And perhaps, too, upon my entrance on this new scene of duty, the sacrifice of a possibly false delicacy is not too great a one to make, as an initiatory offering. My letter is, therefore, at your disposal, to do with it as you see fit.

From the first agitation of the slavery question, I have admired, and on all suitable occasions vindicated, the spirit and constancy with which the abolitionists defended their own rights, and maintained those of their oppressed countrymen; for a long time past, I have fully assented to the doctrines of the Anti-Slavery Society—the sinfulness of the slave system, and the consequent duty and expediency of its immediate abolition; but, I confess, I have arrived very slowly, and I am afraid, I might say reluctantly, at the conclusion, that the course pursued by Mr. Garrison, and the other true friends of the cause, was in accordance with the dictates either of human wisdom or Christian charity. A more accurate knowledge, however, of what their course has really been, and of the difficulties which they have had to encounter; a constantly increasing sense of the enormous wickedness of degrading the children of God, and the brethren of Christ, into the condition of beasts of burden; and, above all, the contemplation of the example set before us by the Great Captain of our Salvation, in the warfare which He waged against the venerable sins and time-hallowed iniquities which He found at His advent reigning in the high places of the earth; these considerations, among others, have satisfied me that I was wrong, and that they were right.

I have deferred, too long! enrolling my name on the list of that noble army, which, for seven years past, has maintained the Right, and gallantly defended the cause of our common Humanity, undiminished by danger and undeterred by obloquy; but I hope that in whatever fields yet remain to be fought, you will find me in the thickest of the fray, at the side of our veteran chiefs, whether the warfare is directed against the open hostility of professed foes, or the more dangerous attacks of hollow friends.

I am, dear Sir, with sentiments of the truest respect and friendship, very truly yours, EDMUND QUINCY.

HENRY G. CHAPMAN, Esq.

EXCELLENT SENTIMENTS.

Our strong-minded friend Charles C. Burleigh, (the Roger Sherman of the anti-slavery cause,) having seriously impaired his health by his incessant labors, has just taken leave for Haiti, in company with another worthy abolition brother, Mr. Lewis C. Gunn of Philadelphia. In a parting letter to the editor of 'Facts for the People,' he gave the following remarks:—

You have seen, doubtless, the melancholy news from Alton—the death of Lovejoy. I felt exceedingly grieved, not merely by the sad catastrophe, but by his departure from the peace principle in attempting to defend himself by force. I should have felt morally certain, had he died unresisting—had he died a martyr to the right principle, that I should have done in the other case. I do feel firm in the belief, that as long as good men keep the truth in principle, and the right in practice, the fury and malice, and violence of wicked men will only help to work out the more speedy overthrow of the wrong, and the more signal triumph of the right; but when the good forsake the high ground of right, and rely on the arm of flesh—the horses and chariots of Egypt—they cannot reasonably expect the same compensation for their sufferings, as when they keep in the right place, and trust alone in truth and righteousness, and the Divine protection. But though Lovejoy erred, and erred so grievously, still he was a noble man, and nobly maintained the right of free discussion, in all but one respect, and has fallen a martyr to a good cause, though I cannot but think, in part, at least, to a wrong mode of contending for a good cause; and I hope that our countrymen are not yet sunk into such a deadly apathy, that this event will not arouse them to a sense of the horrors of mob law, and the importance of speaking out loudly and unfeignedly for order, peace, and freedom of thought and expression."

The editor of the little anti-slavery publication above referred to, addressing abolitionists, says—

While we call upon you to sympathize with his afflicted wife and bereaved family—while we ask you to admire the firmness of which he maintained his principles; let it not be thought that we approve the means to which he resorted for the maintenance of his rights; they are alike irreconcilable with the exposition of sentiments contained in the Declaration of the American Anti-Slavery Society, and the precepts of the Christian religion. The National Society says—

"Our principles forbid the doing of evil that good may come, and lead us to reject, and to entreat the oppressed to reject, the use of all carnal weapons for deliverance from bondage; relying solely upon those which are spiritual, and mighty through God to the pulling down of strong holds."

To this doctrine we fully subscribe; and in view of our responsibility as Christians, must condemn a resort to physical force in any case whatever, whether in defence of life, liberty, or property. We will defend the course pursued by the friends of freedom in Alton; we know that four-fifths of the professors of religion in the land will approve the means by which they defended their rights; yet truth compels us to stamp the seal of our disapprobation upon their course. Their principles, in regard to the doctrine of non-resistance, are our principles, founded, as we believe, upon the rock of Eternal Truth;—their firmness in the maintenance of those principles we admire, and would wish to imitate; their resort to carnal weapons to defend eternal truth, we lament and condemn. We would say, in the language of the Liberator:—

"Far be it from us to reproach our suffering brethren, or weaken the impression of sympathy which has been made on their behalf in the minds of the people,—God forbid! Yet, in the name of Jesus of Nazareth, who suffered himself, unresistingly, to be nailed to the cross, we solemnly protest against any self-proclaimed followers resorting to carnal weapons, under any pretext, or in any extremity whatever."

